App F IX-4

Previous References

Rul 1-32 — 101, 108,
" 1-34-42-17

Later References

1932
(Rul

PRESERVED

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos four

Part B for January 1934

SUBJECT

Complaint against the Proprietor
Ranganatha Soapnut factory
Hospital lane Bangalore city

125)

B Veeranapatha Sq
Hospital lane, Bangalorecity

No. L 5144 & 11/34

Reports him that Govt see
no reason to change
orders already
passed vide No. L 5145 & 11.21
Govt

/ of 1932

Serial No

114 Petition dated nil from one S Sankaranarayana Advocate Bangalore, on behalf of one Veerappa Proprietor Sri Ranganatha Soapnut works City, praying reconsideration of the order rejecting his application to affix a name board, in regard to the running of his factory

Reference to S P R

Orders were passed after obtaining a report from the Inspector and the Director of Health and an endorsement was issued as per Secy's Memo

Submitted for orders with reference

Sd CB
22 6 33

II Member

Sd
22/6

Sd CB
28/6

6) Okay an endorsement be issued to the party stating that Govt see no reason to reconsider the orders passed in the matter. A draft is also put up for consideration of practice followed, as per note dated

Sd PS
30/6/33

Chief Secy

Sd
30/6

RS
4/7/33
Information

Petition dated 12/7/33 from Mr B Veeranagatha 116
Pradhanetan Sree Kanakanatha Jagannath Works
praying inter alia that the order of suspension issued to
the "Intermediate Sweeping Mazdoor to stop coming
his factory" may be withdrawn and that
enquiry may be held before passing any orders as
the previous orders have been passed ex parte

1) On the previous petn, presented by him
the petitioner was informed that Govt
cannot revise the orders already passed
2) Submitted for orders with reference
to
13/7/1933

2) Attention may be drawn to
the endorsement already issued
Dm
18/7

3) Submitted with a draft
reply for perusal before issue
13/7/1933

Dm
21/7

Please see me
15

Rg
21/8/33

With reference to the endorsement given to them
that he should approach the Municipal Council, the
petitioner says that the Municipal Council has issued
the Suspension order only under the direction of Govt and
not on account of any breach of rules or other default
on his part and that the order of Govt to the Mun Council

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No — of 193

Serial No

in Cantonment law as an appeal over the orde
the Commissioner Kottur Municipality Cancel
17 His Contention is that his opponents' n
application for renewal of their licenses should have
been referred to the High Council instead of an order
being issued to the Commissioner suspending the
He prays that the order (passed) by the Commissioner may be
drawn and that the aggrieved party may be asked
to appeal to the Council
& He also prays being heard through
his Counsel

A

Under Sec 182 of the Madras Local Boards Act No licence for establishing a factory is necessary, unless the Chairman applied to the Municipality [illegible] the corresponding section of the old Regn 1871 A [illegible] to the Municipalities automatically. It is not clear in the Act whether provision enables [illegible] in the case to start [illegible] section without a licence [illegible] grant of application [illegible] Neither is ruled [illegible]

Chief Secy) 1678

Q A This may perhaps be ruled

II Member) 14/8 1487

yes

21)

16/8

16/8

Please ascertain from the Secretary to the Municipal Council the date (date & time) of issue of notice to the Member for moving the Court to publish a reply to the Secretary

To the P.A. to the 2nd Member in Council for Municipal Affairs — Parties.

Nothing to be done at present in the matter

Sir Ranganathan — Soapstone Works

File No — of 19 — General and Revenue Secretariat

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL

Ranganatha Soap Works

The case may be posted for hearing on Saturday the 14th October 1933

Submitted with copies of notices, for favour of signature

Issue after Consulting the P.A. to the Member in whose time of hearing

Accounts and books may be produced in the matter

neral and Revenue Secretariat | File No 795/536 of 193

Serial No	
	Notice in L 1781 & 7/9/33 to Mr B Veeranagappa and No L 1782 Jems 2 & 7/9 to the Amildar Bangalore Taluk
	The file will be sent to the 2nd after entering the PA to the Members office on 28/10/33 as date of hearing
	7 9 33 AW
	28 Yes 219
29	The date of hearing has since been adjourned to 28 10 33 Draft + fair quite Send intimation the same to the party are submitted for attestation and signature
	21 9 33 AW
	30 Issue 219
31	The Case stands posted for hearing Saturday the 28th Oct 1933 and the file may now be sent to the II members office, for reference at the time of hearing (Ref para 25th)
	25/10/33 AW
	2 Yes 25/10
244	Personal Asst to the 2nd Mem with contents
	33 25/10 AW
	Petitioner stated 27/10/33 from Venkatachalapathy Hospital Lane Bangalore City that he may also be given a personal hearing and that perm[illegible]

1943 1944

File No | 1 of 1932 | General and Revenue Secretariat

factory to the Proprietor of the Kanganatham Soap Manufactory should be permanently withdrawn.

Letter no nil dated 28/10/33 from Mr Pothu Srinivasa Iyengar requesting that the case posted for being heard on 28/10/33 may be adjourned as he is ill and cannot stir out.

2. Second member's orders on file.

Yes
Sd/- S P -

3. Submitted for orders as to when the case 28/10 may again be posted for hearing and whether notice may be issued to the opposite party viz. Muniswamappa Chetty

Sd/- AW
30/10/33

4. Please send this to the Personal Asst to the Member for Planning etc.

AW
30/10

5. 14th Nov — 3 P M has been approved by the Member

Sd/- W
6/11

2700
6/11

6/11/33 Yes

6. Issued notice

AW
7/11

7. With copies of petitions (Chapter I and II) for approval

Sd/- AW
7/11/33

(a) for the last hearing notice had been sent only to the Proprietary Soap and Works

(b) Mr B M Muniswamappa Chetty who opposed the grant of the licence, have also now worked for being given a hearing. Orders if a notice may be sent to them also so that both the parties may be heard

II Member

AW
7/11

2632
7/11

P

1.1 AW
7/11

Re 1944 re Sri Ramkrishna Banerjee & Sreepur Works - Bangal

App F III

File No 1 of 1952

Serial No	
43	Notices have been issued to both the parties The case stands posted for hearing on 14.11.33 at 3 PM
44)	The file may now be sent to the 2nd members office for reference at the time of hearing.
	88 10 11 33 AM
45)	Yes Hon 10/11 Pl include Asst to the std member of Council both chambers)
	88 11/11
46	Heard the parties
	Hon 14/11
	I heard the parties & perused the W I find no reason to change the order already passed in the case It is clear that the grant of a license would be detrimental to the health of the people in that locality The NA already issued to the Com on 18-5 will be confirmed & the appellant is informed that his petition is reje
	Hon

L 1944

File No / of 193 General and Revenue Secretariat

Submitted with a draft for approval

3/1/34 AH

For perusal before issue

CNO Separate order conforming the instructions given to the Secretary in the letter D/18 S 33 is perhaps necessary)

Chief Secy) 10/1

10/1/34

Issue for 10/1

TYPING SECT 11 JAN 1934 CLNL

11/1/34 To B Veeranagappa Esq Bangalore Inform him that Govt see no reason to change the orders already passed on his economy proposals

vide Secs D 11/1/1934 with memorandum 125

12/1/34





Ml 1-32-114 5795

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE-



Petitioner Veeranagappa
Proprietor, Sri Ranganatha
Soapnut Works, Hospital Road
Bangalore City

The petitioner prays for a review of the order passed on 16/18, May 1933 No L 7572/M L directing him to approach the Municipal Council on the following grounds

1 The Municipal Council in its endorsement dated 29-3-33 says that until final orders are passed by Government he should not proceed with work in the factory and as such the petitioner has to approach the Government in the matter

2 As stated in the petition itself the license was renewed so late as 29-11-1932 and as such the present order greatly prejudices the business of the petitioner and puts him into enormous loss

3 No reasons are alleged why this particular mill out of hundreds working in the heart of the City should be directed to suspend its business even though it is a very old installation working for over 25 years

4 The mill in question is not worked at all hours and every provision is made to conform to the strict conditions of the muchalika imposed upon him

5 The opinion of the Municipal Commissioner and his report in this connection will, the petitioner is confident, bear out his case

6 The petitioner prays for an order revising the order of suspension passed in the case

Sd/- Kanji



ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ

19 — ನೆ ನಂಬರು

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪೋನೆಂಟ್

V S

ಮಾ|| ರಾ|| ಗೆ

ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಜ್ಞೆರುವನಿವಿಗೂ ಕೊ ರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಒರುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಖಾರಕ್ರಮೆ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನಗೆ ಕೊ ರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೆ ಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಲಗು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೆ ನೆ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ನುತ್ಯಾನ ಅಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೂ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದೇನೆ

ತಾರೀಖು ರುಜು

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯ ಸ್ಥರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷ ಮು ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನ ಮಾ ತಂಗಿ ಕರಿಸಿ ಇಧೇನೆ

ಪ್ ವೆಂಡರ್ ಸಂಜಪ್ಪನವರಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತೆ

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT

Section Nil

File No 1-32

Serial No 115

Diary No of letter replied to

No L93

To Endorsement

Granted to Mr Veeranagappa
[Proprietor, Sri Ranganatha Soapnut
works, Hospital Road, Bangalore City]
thro Mr S Srikantaya BA BL
Advocate Bangalore City

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193

In reply to his letter dated
Nil praying for a review of the
orders ~~already~~ passed directing him
to approach the Bangalore City Municipal
in regard to the running of his
factory, Mr Veeranagappa is
informed that Govt ~~See correction~~ Council regret
~~to accord the order already passed~~ the said order
~~in the matter~~

Date of issue 5-7-33

Signed by A J Rao

List of enclosures

5/7/33

B—o

L94

Chief Secy to
Govt

Muz. 55]

No Z 93/ME 1-32-115

WD 0617-GPB-750-10 8 22

GOVERNMENT OF H H THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

~~Muzrai Secretariat~~

Office Memorandum xxxxxxxxxxxx

ENDORSEMENT

To

Dated the 5th July 192xxx 1933

Granted to Mr Veeranagappa,
(Proprietor, Sri Ranganatha Coapnut Works,
Hospital Road, Bangalore City)

THROUGH Mr Srikantaiya, B A , B L ,
Advocate, Bangalore City

In reply to his petition dated nil praying for a review of the order passed directing him to approach the Bangalore City unicipal Council in regard to the running of his factory, Mr Veeranaggppa, is informed that Government cannot revise the said order

By Order,

Sd/- P Ranga Rao

~~For~~ Chief Secretary to Government

R 3/5-7

No Z 94 Dated, 5th July 1933

Copy of the above, is forwarded, with

Compliments, to the Municipal Commissioner Bangalore City, for information

By Order,

Asstt. Officer

For Chief Secretary to Government

F R 2/5-7

Me 1-32-116 & G 3/2

JULY 1933

RUPEES

Before the Dewan,

Of the Government Of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
Received 13-7-33

Petitioner B Veeran ?appa,
Proprietor Sree Rang n tha Soapnut works,
Ho pit l Road, Bang lore City

The petitioner pra?s for a revie? of orders p?ssed by t e govt No 7577/ ? ? ted the 18th May 193? and ? ? dated the 5th July 1933 directing the petitioner to approach the uncipal council on the follo ing grounds

1) The petitioner has been run ing his factory Sree Rangan tha Soapnut works for the last 15 years with permis sion from the Muncipalty adopting all precautionary and safety devi for the satisfaction of the Muncipal re ulation The factory w s burnt due to the mischief of his ene ies no are ? upon ruining him

2) The petitioner has rebuilt a fire proof buildin with permission from t e Muncipality and h s like ise renewed the f ctory licence erected new ordinary at a cost of 1000/- and in the ?or in of the f ctory for a few d ys he had to stop o ing to the suspens n order of t e govt as in the Muncipal com issioner to ith hold the licence pending ? final orders

3) That the Muncipal com is ioner has issued the petitione suspension order only on t e or ers of the govt and not on ccou of breach of r les or any ?ef ult of t e petitioner actin contrary to the uncipal re ulation

4) The petitioner sub its t t he is sustainin ?? loss of 10/- per d y by t is ctio of the govt ic is contr ry to l

5) That the appeal of ? N Narashimi ? , ? mis ? t the govt objecting the ? of licence given to this petitione

of the govt in issuing the order of suspension to the municipal commissioner are contrary to law as an appeal over the orders of the commissioner lies in the hands of the municipal council and not with the govt

6) As per endorsement given to this petitioner by the govt which without vacating the stay order of license, the govt have issued the municipal commissioner illegally, the petitioner begs to submit that he as the aggrieved party to see relief in the municipal council as the municipal commissioner has reasonably and justly renewed the licence of this petitioner

7) That as per opinion of the govt that they have nothing to interfere with the municipal affair they should have done so by cancelling the stay order of licence and should have likewise asked the competent aggrieved party Mr D Narashimiah and others to appeal before the municipal Council with all their grievances over the municipal commissioner in granting this petitioner renewal of licence, and not this petitioner who has got renewed licence from the municipal authorities

8) The petitioner prays that he may be heard before passing any orders as the previous orders have been passed exparte without hearing the petitioner

Under the circumstances the petitioner prays that the order of suspension issued by the govt to the municipal commissioner be released and the govt may kindly be pleased to ask the aggrieved party, Mr Narashimiah and others to appear before the municipal council and further give this petitioner a chance for his legal counsel to explain matters better

Bhaskar Rao
petitioner

July 1960

Bangalore City

536

GEN & REV SECY
28 JUN 1933

Before The IInd Member of Council,

Of the government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Sec & M Sc IC
26 JLY 1933
N 215

Petitioner, B Veeranagappa,
Proprietor Sree Ranganatha Soapnut Works
Hospital Road, Bangalore City

The petitioner begs to submit that he had personally submitted the Dewan of Mysore an application a copy of which here with enclosed

That the dewan was kind enough to direct the petitioner to appeal before you in his inter view with the petitioner as such the petitioner prays that the order of suspension issued by the govt to the Muncipal commissioner be canclled as per his application to the Dewan sahib which has been forwarded to you and that he may be permitted to run his factory Sree Ranganatha soapnut works as before

The Petitioner further prays that his legal council be given an hearing so as to explain matters things better before passing any orders

petitioner

submitted

The main file on the subject was (Dr. 312) submitted with a draft endorsement on 24/7/33 to the chief Sec. This was if approved the [illegible] words and

Before the Dewan,

Of the Government Of His Highness the Maharaja Of Mysore

Petitioner, B Veeranagappa,
Proprietor, Sree Ranganatha Soapnut Works,
Hospital Road, Bangalore City

The Petitioner prays for a review of orders passed by the govt No 757c/M L dated the 18th May 1933 and L 93/M E dated the 15th July 1933 directing the petitioner to approach the Muncipal council on the following grounds

1) The petitioner has been running his factory Sree Ranganatha Soapnut Works for the last 15 years with permission from the Muncipalty adopting all precautionary and safity devices for the satisfaction of the Muncipal regulation The factory was burnt due to the mischief of his enemies who are bent upon ruining him

2) The petitioner rebult a fire proof building with permission from the Muncipalty and has like wise renewed the factory licence erected new machinary at a cost of Rs 10000/- and in the working of the factory for a few days he had to stop the same owing to the suspension order of the govt asking the Muncipal commissioner to with hold my licence pending their final orders

3) That the Muncipal commissioner has issued the suspension to the petitioner only on the orders of the govt and not on account of breech of rules or any default of the petitioner acting contrary to the muncipal regulation

4) The petitioner submits that he is sustaining a loss of Rs 10/- per day by this action of the govt which is contrary to law

5) That the appeal of B M Narashimah and Munisamappa to the govt objecting the renewal of licence given to this petitioner and the interference of the govt in issuing the order of suspensio

Suspension to the Muncipal commissioner are contrary to law as an appeal over the orders of the Municipal Commissioner lie in the hands of the ~~gmx~~ Muncipal Council and not with the govt

c) As per endorsement given to this petitioner by the govt with out vacating the stay order of licence, the govt have issue the Muncipal commissioner illegally the petitioner begs to subm that he is not the agrieved party to seek relief in the muncipal council as the Muncipal commissioner has reasonably and justly renewed the licence of this petitioner

/) That as per opinion of the govt that they have nothing to interfere in the muncipal affair thaey should have done so by cancli the stay order of licence and should have like wise asked the compet-ant aggrieved party Mr B M Narashimiah and others toappeal before the Muncipal council with all their grievances over the Muncipal commissi in granting this petitioner renewal of licence and not this petitione who has renewed licence from the muncipal authorites

8) The petitioner prays that he may be heard before passing any orders as the previous orders have been passed exparte with out hearing the petitioner

Under the circumstances the petitioner prays that the order of suspension issued by the govt to the Muncipal commissioner be released and the govt may kindly be pleased to ask the agrieved party Mr Narashimah and others to appeal before the muncipal council and further give this petitioner a hearing for his leg l council to explain matters better

Petitioner

12th July 1955

Bangalore City

ನೋಟೀಸ್

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಜನರಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಸೆಕ್ರಿಟರಿಯವರ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ

1933—1934 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಅಪೀಲು ನಂಬರು

ಅಪೀಲು ವಾದಿ

ಅಪೀಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ

ವಿಷಯ

ಮೇಲೆಕಂಡ ಅಪೀಲು ಕಾರಿ ಬಿ. ನಿರಂಜನ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳವರಿಗೆ

ಅಪೀಲು ವಾದಿ

~~ಡಿಪ್ಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರ್~~ ರವರಿಗೆ

~~ಡಿಪ್ಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಕಮಿಷನರವರ~~ ಹುಕುಮಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ದಾಖಲುಮಾಡಿ ಇರುವ ಅಪೀಲು 1933-34 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ 14 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು (14.10.33) ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಡುವುದರಿಂದೆ ಆ ದಿವಸ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ~~ಹತ್ತು~~ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ನೀವು ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೆಕು

1781/pul ಬ ತಾರೀಖು 16 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ 1933 ಇಸವಿ

ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

By Order,

Chief Secretary to Govt

The Electric Welding Company
B P Rose - Secretary
Room 1111 Woolworth Building
New York City
Sept. 33

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗ್ವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಜನರಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ
ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ

ನಂಬರ L 1782/ml
encls 2

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು—ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಅಮಲ್ದಾರ್ರಿಗೆ ಒರಿ

ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವ ನಮೂನ ಅದಾಗಿ—

ಇಸ್ವಿನ ಸನ್ 1932—1933 ನೆ ಇಸವಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಆಫೀಸ್ ನಿಂದ ನೆ ತಂಜಾವೂರು

ವೊಕದ್ದ ಸಿಯ ಕಛೇರಿಗಾರರು ಮೊರ್ಜಿನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾದವರ

ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ತಯಾರಾದ ನೋಟಿಸುಗಳನ್ನ ಇದರ ಹಮೆರಪಾ

ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುತ್ತೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಜಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಲಸ್ತ್ ನೋಟಿಸುಗಳನ್ನ ಕೂಡ್ಲೆ ಈ ಆಫೀಸಿಗೆ ವಾಪಸ

ಕಳುಹಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು

ಬ ತಾರೀಖು ನೇ ಮೊಹೆ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ 1933 ನೆ

TALUK OFFICE
8 SEP 1933
BANGALORE

By Order

Asubbarao
Chief Secretary

WD 3218—GPB—1 000—1

1943
L

To

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL

Bangalore

Respected Sir,

Subject - Complaint of the residents of the Hospital Lane Bangalore City in re the Manganatha Soapnut Factory located at the place
---

And The case is posted for hearing to tomorrow
29
nd

We beg to be executed for once again troubling you in the above matter Inspite of our repeated representations to the Municipal Authorities and to Government bring to - notice the nuisance caused to the residents of the lane by the running of the Factory referred to above our grievences still stand unredressed Herewith we submit to your honour's perusal copies of articles dated 26 and 28th November 1932 and 29th August 1933 which have appeared in the matter in the - several newspapers in the city From the articles the feelings of residents may be clearly made out We hear that the - Director of Health as well as the Superintendent of Industries personally inspected the spot and have expressed opinions - against encouraging the running of such factories in a densely populated lane like ours

Inspite of a suspension order issued restraining the Proprietor from running the factory the latter is being worked for the last few weeks

We pray that we may also be given a hearing in the matter and that the permission if any granted to the - Proprietor for running the factory be permanently withdrawn

We beg to remain

Residents of the Lane

Dated 27th October 1933

Bangalore

B M Narasimiah
and others

'DAILY POST' DATED 29TH AUGUST 1933

Alleged Mill Nuisance in City

Sir, - Although the Municipal Regulation prohibits the establishment of any factory or workshop in densely populated areas and amidst dwelling houses, a number of flour mills, &c , run by electric power have sprung up here and there in the midst of residential houses in the City, causing no small amount of nuisance to the neighbourhood The - Municipality has been remiss in permitting such factories to spring up in congested areas One such mill, which was established in the Hospital Lane, Bangalore City, behind the Mental Hospital, and which specialised in soapnut powder caught fire, destroying the building in which it was located and damaging certain adjoining buildings The Proprietor of that mill has once more re-established the mill in the same place, despite the objections raised by the poor - residents of the neighbourhood and the hopes they entertained of its removal when the Directors of the Health Department and the Industries and Commerce Department visited the - locality and expressed their opinion against its retention By the revival of the activities of the mill, the adjoining buildings once more begin to reverberate, and the dust - nuisance emanating from the mill has once more become - oppressive

Several petitions to the Municipality and the Government on the subject have been made by the residents of the locality, but they have, so far obtained no redress Will the benign Government and the Municipality kindly vouchsafe their attention to this all important matter, even at this late hour?

Yours Faithfully

A RESIDENT

'BANGALORE MAIL' November 26, 1932.

Power Mills In Populated Areas

To

The Editor,

The Bangalore Mail.

Sir, -

Although the Municipal Regulation prohibits the establishment of any factory of workshop in densely populated areas and amidst dwelling houses, a number of flour mills &c , run by electric power have sprung up here and there in midst of residential houses in the City causing no small amount of nuisance to the neighbourhood One such mill which was established in - Bangalore but not far from the Dental Hospital, - recently caught fire destroying the building in which it was located, the fire damaging certain adjoining buildings It now appears that the proprietor is once more re-establishing the mill in the same place and that the Municipality is not unwilling to permit him to do so despite the objections raised by the residents of the neighbourhood It is hoped that the concerned - authorities will keep a close watch and not allow the rules to be contravened

A Resident

-o-

'BANGALOR MAIL' - November 28, 1932

Power Mills in Bpulated areas

Sir,-

With reference to "a Resident's' letter in your issue of the 26th instant in which he states that an electric power flour mill which was established in Bangalore City not far from the Mental Hospital, recently caught fire, destroying building in which it was - located, the fire damaging certain adjoining buildings, the wonder is that the fire did not spread to the - Mental Hospital itself and the Government Medical Stores which, if it did, would have caused incalculable loss to both life and public property The locality - referred to by your correspondent is a business one and one cannot see how the Municipality could refuse - permission for the re-establishment of the flour mill already ready, therefore, appears to be for the removal of the Mental Hospital and the Medical Stores, from amids such dangerous surroundings away, say at least 3 miles from the City proper Mental Hospitals in other cities which I have visited, are located at a considerable distance from the dir and confusion of business centres

Yours truly

Bangalore
28-11-32

Sd/- C Burton

No. S 2159/ml

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Bangalore 21-9-33

Appeal Case No 8ms **of 19** 33 **3rd**

Appellant

B. Veeranagappa
Sri Ranganatha Swamy Vs
Works Hospital Road Bangalore

Respondent

Government

The above case is ~~posted~~ adjourned for hearing to 28-10-1933
Saturday at 3 P M

Subject

Praying for a reexamination of the orders directing him to appear before the Board in regard to the running of his factory

By Order

Asstt. Secretary to Govt.
~~Development Department~~

A
REPRE [illegible]T E S RL GI L VE U IL
CHAIRM [illegible] SCHO L BOARD C TY MUNICI BLY & MU C P L O NCILLO L A EA
Ref No

Bangalor Cty 28. Oct 1933

1944

To

The Chief Secretary

to the Government of His

Highness the Maharaja of

Mysore Bangalore

Sir

As I am in bed, suffering from fever I am unable to stir out I request that the Appeal of Mr Veeranagappa Re the Suspension of the Flour Mill Licence, may kindly be adjourned

I request that my absence may kindly be excused

Yours Obediently,

[signature]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

No. L 3201 L
L 3202 dff

Bangalore — 8/4/33

Appeal Case No nos — **of 1933-34**

Appellant Veeranagappa Sri Ranganatha Soap Works Hospital Road Vs *Respondent* Govt

& Mr Muniswamappa Hospital Road Bangalore

The above case is posted for hearing to 14 Tue November 1933 ion mil
~~Saturday~~ at 3 P M

By Order

No 1-32

No 125

Subject
grant of permission for running a Soap Factory in the locality (on) Hospital Road Bangalore (dff)
1934

Govt of Mysore
Secretariat Govt
Development Department

To

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 11-1-34

Signed by Mr A Subba Rao

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

dorsement

Granted to mr B Veeranagappa Proprietor, Sri Ranganatha Soap works, Hospital Lane, Bangalore City

& reply to his petition dated 12/7/33 praying ~~that in view of the sanction issued to him and~~ directing ~~him to stop running his factory may be withdrawn etc,~~ Mr Veeranagappa is informed ~~that~~ Govt see no reason to ~~interfere with~~ change the orders already passed and ~~that~~ his petition is accordingly rejected.

for a review of the order of Govt directing him to approach the Town Council in connection with the suspension of the license to run his Soap and Factory

Memo 2-5145 dt 11-6-34

Copy of the foregoing is forwarded, with compliments, to the Accountant Bangalore city for information in continuation of this Office No. 2-7575-RE/32-108 dt 18-5-33

Ack 1/91 Forwarding Fees to Govt

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated Bangalore 11th Jan 1934

No L 5144
Mc1-32-125

ENDORSEMENT

Granted to Mr B Veeranagappa Proprietor Sri Ranga natha Soapnut Works Hospital Lane Bangalore City

---

In reply to his petition dated 14th July 1933 praying for a revies of the order of Government directin him to approach the Municipal Council in connection with the suspension of lc license to run his Soapnut Factory Mr Veeranagappa is informed that Govt cannot see no reason to change the orders already passed and that his petition is accordingly rejected

order,

Sd/- R Ranga Rao
Chief Secretary to Government

C R G 3

P T O

Memo No 145 dated Bangalore the 11

Copy of the foregoing is forwarded with [illegible] to the Municipal Commissioner Bangalore City for information in continuation of this office No L 7575/M1 108 dated 18th May 1933

By order

Chief Secretary to Govern[illegible]